DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 694 HE 002 100

AUTHOR	Kennedy, W. Robert
TITLE	A Comparison of Selected Student Attitudes Preceding and Following the Events of May 4, 1970, on the Campus of Kent State University.
INSTITUTION	American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 71
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, February, 1971
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation, Faculty, *Higher Education, Measurement Instruments, Self Concept, *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Kent State University

ABSTRACT

This study is based on the results of two identical attitude instruments that were administered to students at Kent State University before and after the shooting of four students by National Guardsmen on May 4, 1970. The attitude instruments had been constructed to permit interconcept comparisons with one data collection. The purpose of this study was to determine whether the events surrounding May 4th had significantly influenced the attitudes of Kent State undergraduates. On a scale of 1 through 9, the students were asked to rate 38 variables concerning (1) how they expected Kent State University to be, (2) Kent State Students, (3) Kent State faculty, (4) the ideal teacher, (5) the real self, and (6) the ideal self. The findings indicated that after the May 4 events the students viewed the University, the faculty, and themselves as more friendly and personable than before. (AF)

ED049694

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH

STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION

RESEARCH

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH

STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION
STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISION

HE 002 100

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Comparison of Selected Student Attitudes
Preceding and Following the Events of May 4, 1970,
on the Campus of Kent State University

W. Robert Kennedy
Kent State University

This study was an outgrowth of the events following May 4, 1970, on the campus of Kent State University. The objectives of the original study (pre-May 4), relating to the evaluation of student attitudes, had been achieved with the collection of data by mid-April. The subsequent shutdown of the University presented the opportunity for a post-May 4 comparison using those students who were in the previous sample. The identical instrument was sent to them and my mid-June 61.4 per cent had been completed and returned. The combination of these data formed the basis for the analysis to be presented.

The attitude instrument used had been constructed to permit inter-concept comparisons with one data collection. Thus, attitudes could be compared between a concept such as KSU FACULTY and those relating to IDEAL-TEACHER. Differences (using factor scores) could then be investigated using various categories of rater classification such as sex, college membership, class standing, etc. - this was the purpose of the pre-May 4 study. However, new objectives were developed with the addition of the post-May 4 data. It then was of interest to know whether the inter-concept comparisons of the post-data would have a significantly different pattern

---

This paper was presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, February, 1971.

of relationships than found in the pre-data. In addition, using the intra-concept comparisons, pre-post, were there changes in the attitudes of the students either positively or negatively? Thus, this study was an attempt to evaluate the attitudes of a sample of Kent State University undergraduates to determine whether the events surrounding May 4 had significantly influenced their attitudes as reflected by the instrument employed.

SAMPLE

This sample consisted of undergraduate students (predominently sophomores and juniors) enrolled in an introductory Political Science course on the main campus of Kent State University, Spring Quarter, 1970. The group (N=176) participating in the pre-May 4 study was made up of students from all colleges, a variety of academic majors, and included both males and females. The sample returning their forms in the post-May 4 collection totalled 108 (61.4 per cent return) and consisted of 29 males and 79 females from the Colleges of Education - 48, Arts and Sciences - 22, Fine and Professional Arts - 11, Business - 11, with the remaining participants (16) not indicating their college membership.

INSTRUMENT

The semantic differential instrument (all concepts rated by the same thirty-eight bi-polar adjective pairs) had previously been used with incoming Kent State University students in the summers of 1966 and 1967. It was chosen because of its obvious availability, in addition to the possibility of having a limited follow-up with a number of former freshmen students who were now juniors. The

basic format of thirty-eight adjective pairs remained unchanged; however, three additional concepts were added, making a total of six which included KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, KSU STUDENTS, KSU FACULTY, IDEAL-TEACHER, REAL-SELF, and IDEAL-SELF (see Appendix A). Logical comparisons were thus possible between the first and second, third and fourth, and fifth and sixth for differences in attitudes. Although data had been gathered previously, neither validity nor reliability information was available.

PROCEDURE

Scoring - The thirty-eight bi-polar adjective pairs were scored using social desirability as the criterion for reflection (See Table 1). All adjective pairs were scored the same across the six concepts with low scores being the more positive.

Scale Development - The principal component analysis was used to develop scales from which factor scores could be computed and intra-concept comparisons were made. Using 1.00 values inserted in the diagonals, the component analysis was done using the thirty-eight adjectives to define the matrix. A single analysis was completed using twelve concepts per person - no effort having been made to consider sub-classifications such as pre and post-data, sex, college, etc., for a similar data treatment.

Previous component analysis of these adjective pairs indicated that four factors best explained the space so the seven factors resulting from the first analysis were reduced to five using the varimax rotation. On the basis of logical interpretation and considering the alignment of items the final number was four. The

total variance accounted for with these factors was 49.24 per cent with factor one contributing 24.99 per cent, factor two - 7.45 per cent, factor three - 9.75 per cent, and factor four - 7.05 per cent. The .3000 value was used as the cutoff for inclusion of items on each factor. Complete simple structure was not attained since thirteen of the items had significant loadings on two factors and two items were included on three of the factors (see Table II). However, due to their logical consistency, further rotations were not done.

The four factors with their items and loadings are presented in Table III. Factor 1, a broadly defined 'Social Desirability' dimension is the largest of the factors and includes such adjectives as bold, friendly, wise, etc. Factor 2, 'Academic Attitude', although having the fewest number of items is consistent throughout and reflects the qualities traditionally given to the academic community. Factor 3, a 'Maturity-Stability' component, reflects self-confidence, a sureness of purpose, with such terms as believing, realistic, sober, and relaxed, being included. Factor 4 is the only bi-polar factor and was defined as 'Contemporary vs. Traditional', reflecting an attempt to relate to both the attitudes and the life-style currently in vogue among youth. Included are such terms as non-traditional, immoral, intoxicated and non-collegiate in opposition to the attitudes conveyed by such words as bold, esthetic, and individualistic.

Objectives - This study had the following objectives:

1. Are there significant changes among the relationships found (inter-concept comparisons for each factor) when the pre-May 4 analyses are compared to the post-May 4 data?

2. Are there significant changes in student attitudes on the basis of intra-concept comparisons (across each of the four factors) between the pre and post-May 4 data?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data from both pre and post-May 4 were compared by factor using dependent t-tests with the level of significance for reported findings set at .05 for a two-tailed test. The first analyses were performed on both pre and post-data to evaluate possible differences between the students' attitudes toward KENT STATE UNIVERSITY vs. KSU STUDENTS, KSU FACULTY vs. IDEAL-TEACHER, and REAL-SELF vs. IDEAL-SELF. These results are reported in Tables IV and V. All t-test values were significant. When Tables IV and V are compared, it is evident that the direction and size of the difference is nearly always identical. Thus, in reference to Objective 1, there was no significant change among the relationships found in the pre-May 4 data when compared to the post-May 4 results. For purposes of the following discussion, Tables IV and V will be considered simultaneously.

The first inter-concept comparison used KENT STATE UNIVERSITY vs. KSU STUDENTS. All t-values were significant at the $p \leq .001$ level. Interpreting these findings by factors, the students saw themselves as having more socially desirable qualities (Factor 1)

than did the University in general. This was also found on Factor 2 where students were viewed as having more 'academic' concerns than the University. Both findings suggest an impersonal, non-scholarly, and generally low social desirability evaluation of the University on the part of students. However, Factor 3, the 'maturity-stability' dimension was seen as being more characteristic of the school than the students. Factor 4, the 'contemporary vs. traditional' attitude was seen as being exemplified by students more than the University. Taken together, the findings of Factors 3 and 4 suggest that opposed to its students, the University is seen as very stable and establishment-oriented, without the contemporary behavior seen as important by today's standards. At this point one wonders whether the attitudes and values found in Factor 3 are viewed as 'contemporary' by students. If they are, will they strive to integrate them into their own life-styles?

The KSU FACULTY vs. IDEAL-TEACHER comparison shows that the students saw the faculty as having fewer of the socially desirable qualities (Factor 1), being less academically-oriented (Factor 2), not possessing enough of the maturity-stability dimension (Factor 3), and lacking in the contemporary attitudes (Factor 4) seen as important by students when the qualities of this 'ideal-teacher' are defined.

The last inter-concept comparison was between REAL-SELF and IDEAL-SELF. Here the striving for more of the socially desirable qualities, for maturity and stability, as well as a greater desire for contemporary attitudes is evident. Surprisingly, they also

wished to have less of the 'academic' attitude they currently perceive in themselves. In answer to the question raised previously concerning whether students saw the values reflected in the maturity-stability dimension as important it would appear that they see these qualities positively and to be desired for integration with their contemporary values. In addition, their apparent lack of academic attitude could reflect a desire for a greater 'activism' and 'involvement' than they currently have. Currently they see themselves as being too academically-oriented with too few of the qualities exemplified by contemporary student values. They seem to be saying, we want less academic involvement, more contemporary values, while integrating the traditionally seen socially desirable qualities into our life-styles and attitudes.

The pattern of relationships for both the pre and post-data are logical and consistent with what one would expect under such circumstances. In general, students would tend to see any large university as impersonal, rather non-academic, and lacking in the contemporary values of our youth-oriented society. The same evaluation would be expected for the faculty and even the self-evaluation - both would reflect a striving or reaching for the socially desired qualities currently in vogue. These findings may be the result of the comparisons that were made. Concepts measuring the real world are always in possession of a fewer number of the desired qualities than either the ideal (as with Ideal-Self and Ideal-Teacher) or the comparative group with which one identifies (KSU Students vs. Kent State University).

Table VI shows the pre-post intra-concept comparisons on each of the four factors. Of the twenty-four computed t-values, twelve were significant. Factors 1 and 3 had five which were significant, Factor 4 had two, while Factor 2 had none.

The concept KENT STATE UNIVERSITY was seen as being significantly more socially desirable (Factor 1) following May 4. However, the students also saw it as having been shaken by the events and not manifesting the mature, stable, self-confident attributes (Factor 3) it had a month before.

The KSU STUDENT comparison reflected the same change as noted for the University in terms of greater social desirability and less mature, stable qualities. In addition, they saw less of the contemporary uninhibited, immoral attitudes being manifested by themselves. It appears that the students also saw the event as causing a 'turning-in' among themselves with the consequent positive understanding and behavior which would be expected along with a de-emphasis of their contemporary attitudes.

The evaluation of KSU FACULTY also saw the perception of this group as having more positive qualities and being less self-confident and mature following May 4.

The IDEAL-TEACHER comparisons showed no significant changes except on the contemporary attitude scale. Here the students expressed their dissatisfaction with this person having adopted too much of the modern vs. traditional style. This could reflect a general unhappiness with either the role or the behavior as displayed by some of the 'activists'or 'mod' teachers on campus following May 4.

The last two intra-concept comparisons were REAL-SELF and IDEAL-SELF - the findings were identical. Both concepts reflected the students impressions of greater possession of the socially-desirable qualities while showing a significant decrease in their self-confidence and degree of maturity following May 4. In the evaluation of the REAL-SELF, the contemporary attitude scale showed a decrease, not significant, in their desire to adopt values as reflected in this factor. Here again, this suggests a questioning of the new values with the accompanying search for definition of purpose which occurred following the University shutdown.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study suggest that the attitudes of this sample of undergraduates was obviously affected by the events of May 4. They suddenly saw the University, the faculty, and themselves in a more positive manner while reinforcing the mood of indecision and lack of direction which abounded at that time. Considering what had occurred, this was to be expected.

Immediately before the tragic shootings of May 4, the University had been caught unprepared for the rioting and damage done to the Kent community. The general administrative reaction was minimal. Subsequently with the charges made by the Governor and his dispensing of National Guardsmen to the campus, turmoil prevailed and everyone within the University felt detached and without a voice in the proceedings. The events of Sunday night, the shootings on May 4, and the unexpected shutdown which resulted, all tended to put the University in a seemingly powerless position without

direction and, to a degree, identity. Within a very short time the feelings of the Kent community as well as the state of Ohio were manifested and all were negative. The injunction placed upon the University officials immediately before and following the Grand Jury report again reinforced the view that the University was lacking direction, purpose, and simply the strength to react. This mood continued over the summer and has not been completely dispelled to date. Although the students have returned and the worst fears (the closing of the University, riots, etc.) have not come true, a general tension is still apparent and will be with this community for some time.

With this attack from outside the University, a natural 'turning-inward' occurred. All segments of the University became closely allied in the fight to 'KEEP KENT OPEN'; therefore, it was predictable that the students would view the University, the faculty, and themselves as more friendly and personable. It reflected a new and real change from the past. In addition, the decline in importance of the contemporary attitudes and values would suggest that this was also a natural outgrowth of events. Here, with the attempt to literally survive as a University in a hostive community, it would be expected that the contemporary view or life-style would be de-emphasized to increase the intra-academic community communication - all parties, faculty members, staff, and students alike, worked to know one another better and in so doing the loss of previous values occurred. Faculty members became more personable and students became less radical than they had been

previously. Unfortunately, no data is available to compare the attitudes of 'radicals' with 'conservatives' or any similar classification. Our data can only speak for a small sample of undergraduates without the capability to define their political views and attitudes.

Considering the findings of this study overall, the inter-concept comparisons reflect predictable results which occur when an 'ideal' is compared to a 'real' concept. There is the natural tendency to de-emphasize the qualities of the real and to strive for a socially-desirable ideal - this was evident throughout. However, the results of the intra-concept comparisons speak to changes that have become evident across the University. There has been a very definite personalization by all groups in addition to a concerted effort being given to the re-definition of our purposes and out identify. These findings are thus consistent with the unresearched yet apparent attitudes that have prevailed on this campus since May 4, 1970.

APPENDIX A

The purpose of the following questionnaires is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. A concept will be given to you, followed by the scales. The scales have nine numbers on them with an adjective on each side. You are to decide which adjective most fits the concept you are rating and then how strongly you would apply this adjective to the concept. You are to circle the appropriate number where a 5 indicates "Uncertain"; 6,7,8,9, indicate increasing degree of agreement with the adjective on the right; and 4,3,2,1 indicate increasing amounts of agreement with the adjective on the left.

Remember:

1. You can circle any number from 1 through 9.
2. Be sure to clearly circle a number for each scale for every concept - <u>do not omit any</u>.
3. Only fill in one number on a single scale.
4. Please make your judgements on the basis of what these concepts mean to you.

Make each item a separate and independent judgement. Work at a fairly high speed. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true impressions.

Example:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
good	-	-	-	-	(5)	-	-	-	-	bad
dependent	-	(2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	independent
hot	-	-	-	-	-	-	(7)	-	-	cold
active	1	2	3	(4)	5	6	7	8	9	inactive
simple	-	-	(3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	complex

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

The concept we are asking you to rate is KSU as you anticipate it will be. We are interested in how you view Kent State - the description you would use to characterize its general environment as you expect to find it. Please keep this in mind while making your ratings.

		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
1.	cautious	- - - - - - - - -	uninhibited
2.	collegiate	- - - - - - - - -	noncollegiate
3.	idealistic	- - - - - - - - -	realistic
4.	competent	- - - - - - - - -	incompetent
5.	restless	- - - - - - - - -	easy going
6.	moral	- - - - - - - - -	immoral
7.	traditional	- - - - - - - - -	traditionless
8.	respected	- - - - - - - - -	unrespected
9.	tense	- - - - - - - - -	relaxed
10.	scholarly	- - - - - - - - -	nonscholarly
11.	esthetic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	task-oriented
12.	uncertain	- - - - - - - - -	confident
13.	sober	- - - - - - - - -	intoxicated
14.	concerned	- - - - - - - - -	indifferent
15.	friendly	- - - - - - - - -	unfriendly
16.	skeptical	- - - - - - - - -	believing
17.	academic achievement	- - - - - - - - -	nonacademic achievement
18.	togetherness	- - - - - - - - -	individualism
19.	beneficial	- - - - - - - - -	harmful
20.	social welfare	- - - - - - - - -	laissez faire
21.	sophisticated	- - - - - - - - -	unsophisticated
22.	complex	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	simple
23.	sociable	- - - - - - - - -	unsociable
24.	interesting	- - - - - - - - -	dull
25.	disciplined	- - - - - - - - -	undisciplined
26.	good	- - - - - - - - -	bad
27.	challenging	- - - - - - - - -	unchallenging
28.	democratic	- - - - - - - - -	authoritarian
29.	bold	- - - - - - - - -	timid
30.	selfish	- - - - - - - - -	generous
31.	academic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	vocational
32.	dependent	- - - - - - - - -	self reliant
33.	strict	- - - - - - - - -	lenient
34.	ambitious	- - - - - - - - -	lazy
35.	foolish	- - - - - - - - -	wise
36.	dynamic	- - - - - - - - -	stagnant
37	optimistic	- - - - - - - - -	pessimistic
38.	masculine	- - - - - - - - -	feminine

KSU STUDENTS

The concept we are now asking you to rate is STUDENTS who attend KSU - as you expect them to be. Please keep KSU STUDENTS in mind while making your ratings.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
39.	cautious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	uninhibited
40.	collegiate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	noncollegiate
41.	idealistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	realistic
42.	competent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	incompetent
43.	restless	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	easy going
44.	moral	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	immoral
45.	traditional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	traditionless
46.	respected	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unrespected
47.	tense	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	relaxed
48.	scholarly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonscholarly
49.	esthetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	task-oriented
50.	uncertain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	confident
51.	sober	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	intoxicated
52.	concerned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	indifferent
53.	friendly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unfriendly
54.	skeptical	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	believing
55.	academic achievement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonacademic achievement
56.	togetherness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	individualism
57.	beneficial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	harmful
58.	social welfare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	laissez faire
59.	sophisticated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsophisticated
60.	complex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	simple
61.	sociable	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsociable
62.	interesting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	dull
63.	disciplined	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	undisciplined
64.	good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	bad
65.	challenging	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unchallenging
66.	democratic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	authoritarian
67.	bold	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	timid
68.	selfish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	generous
69.	academic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vocational
70.	dependent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	self reliant
71.	strict	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	lenient
72.	ambitious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	lazy
73.	foolish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	wise
74.	dynamic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	stagnant
75.	optimistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	pessimistic
76.	masculine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	feminine

KSU FACULTY

The concept we are asking you to rate is the KSU FACULTY. We are interested in how you characterize the FACULTY at this University. Please make sure that you keep in mind the KSU FACULTY when making your ratings.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
77.	cautious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	uninhibited
78.	collegiate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	noncollegiate
79.	idealistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	realistic
80.	competent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	incompetent
81.	restless	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	easygoing
82.	moral	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	immoral
83.	traditional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	traditionless
84.	respected	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unrespected
85.	tense	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	relaxed
86.	scholarly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonscholarly
87.	esthetic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	task-oriented
88.	uncertain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	confident
89.	sober	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	intoxicated
90.	concerned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	indifferent
91.	friendly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unfriendly
92.	skeptical	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	believing
93.	academic achievement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonacademic achievement
94.	togetherness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	individualism
95.	beneficial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	harmful
96.	social welfare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	laissez faire
97.	sophisticated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsophisticated
98.	complex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	simple
99.	sociable	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsociable
100.	interesting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	dull
101.	disciplined	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	undisciplined
102.	good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	bad
103.	challenging	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unchallenging
104.	democratic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	authoritarian
105.	bold	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	timid
106.	selfish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	generous
107.	academic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vocational
108.	dependent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	self reliant
109.	strict	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	lenient
110.	ambitious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	lazy
111.	foolish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	wise
112.	dynamic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	stagnant
113.	optimistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	pessimistic
114.	masculine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	feminine

IDEAL - TEACHER

The concept we are asking you to rate is IDEAL-TEACHER. We are interested in how you would characterize this person. Please keep the concept of IDEAL-TEACHER in mind while making your ratings.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
115.	cautious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	uninhibited
116.	collegiate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	noncollegiate
117.	idealistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	realistic
118.	competent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	incompetent
119.	restless	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	easy going
120.	moral	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	immoral
121.	traditional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	traditionless
122.	respected	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unrespected
123.	tense	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	relaxed
124.	scholarly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonscholarly
125.	esthetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	task-oriented
126.	uncertain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	confident
127.	sober	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	intoxicated
128.	concerned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	indifferent
129.	friendly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unfriendly
130.	skeptical	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	believing
131.	academic achievement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonacademic achievement
132.	togetherness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	individualism
133.	beneficial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	harmful
134.	social welfare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	laissez faire
135.	sophisticated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsophisticated
136.	complex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	simple
137.	sociable	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsociable
138.	interesting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	dull
139.	disciplined	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	undisciplined
140.	good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	bad
141.	challenging	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unchallenging
142.	democratic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	authoritarian
143.	bold	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	timid
144.	selfish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	generous
145.	academic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vocational
146.	dependent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	self reliant
147.	strict	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	lenient
148.	ambitious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	laxy
149.	foolish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	wise
150.	dynamic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	stagnant
151.	optimistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	pessimistic
152.	masculine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	feminine

REAL - SELF

The concept we are now asking you to rate is your REAL SELF. We are interested in how you view yourself - the description you would use to characterize yourself. Please keep the concept of REAL SELF in mind while making your ratings.

		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	
153.	cautious	- - - - - - - - -	uninhibited
154.	collegiate	- - - - - - - - -	noncollegiate
155.	idealistic	- - - - - - - - -	realistic
156.	competent	- - - - - - - - -	incompetent
157.	restless	- - - - - - - - -	easy going
158.	moral	- - - - - - - - -	immoral
159.	traditional	- - - - - - - - -	traditionless
160.	respected	- - - - - - - - -	unrespected
161.	tense	- - - - - - - - -	relaxed
162.	scholarly	- - - - - - - - -	nonscholarly
163.	esthetic	- - - - - - - - -	task-oriented
164.	uncertain	- - - - - - - - -	confident
165.	sober	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	intoxicated
166.	concerned	- - - - - - - - -	indifferent
167.	friendly	- - - - --- - - -	unfriendly
168.	skeptical	- - - - - - - - -	believing
169.	academic achievement	- - - - - - - - -	nonacademic achievement
170.	togetherness	- - - - - - - - -	individualism
171.	beneficial	- - - - - - - - -	harmful
172.	social welfare	- - - - - - - - -	laissez faire
173.	sophisticated	- - - - - - - - -	unsophisticated
174.	complex	- - - - - - - - -	simple
175.	sociable	- - - - - - - - -	unsociable
176.	interesting	- - - - - - - - -	dull
177.	disciplined	- - - - - - - - -	undisciplined
178.	good	- - - - - - - - -	bad
179.	challenging	- - - - - - - - -	unchallenging
180.	democratic	- - - - - - - - -	authoritarian
181.	bold	- - - - - - - - -	timid
182.	selfish	- - - - - - - - -	generous
183.	academic	- - - - - - - - -	vocational
184.	dependent	- - - - - - - - -	self-reliant
185.	strict	- - - - - - - - -	lenient
186.	ambitious	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	lazy
187.	foolish	- - - - - - - - -	wise
188.	dynamic	- - - - - - - - -	stagnant
189.	optimistic	- - - - - - - - -	pessimistic
190	masculine	- - - - - - - - -	feminine

IDEAL- SELF

The concept we now want you to rate is your IDEAL-SELF. We are interested in how you characterize yourself as you would like to be. Please keep the concept of your IDEAL-SELF in mind while making your ratings.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
190.	cautious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	uninhibited
191.	collegiate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	noncollegiate
192.	idealistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	realistic
193.	competent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	incompetent
194.	restless	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	easy going
195.	moral	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	immoral
196.	traditional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	traditionless
197.	respected	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unrespected
198.	tense	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	relaxed
199.	scholarly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonscholarly
200.	esthetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	task-oriented
201.	uncertain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	confident
202.	sober	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	intoxicated
203.	concerned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	indifferent
204.	friendly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unfriendly
205.	skeptical	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	believing
206.	academic achievement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonacademic achievement
207.	togetherness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	individualism
208.	beneficial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	harmful
209.	social welfare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	laissez faire
210.	sophisticated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsophisticated
211.	complex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	simple
212.	sociable	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsociable
213.	interesting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	dull
214.	disciplined	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	undisciplined
215.	good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	bad
216.	challenging	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unchallenging
217.	democratic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	authoritarian
218.	bold	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	timid
219.	selfish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	generous
220.	academic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vocational
221.	dependent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	self reliant
222.	strict	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	lenient
223.	ambitious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	lazy
224.	foolish	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	wise
225.	dynamic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	stagnant
226.	optimistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	pessimistic
227.	masculine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	feminine

APPENDIX B

Table I

Bipolar Adjective Pairs With The Positively Scored Adjectives Listed At The Left

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
uninhibited	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	cautious
collegiate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	noncollegiate
realistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	idealistic
competent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	incompetent
easygoing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	restless
moral	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	immoral
traditional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	traditionless
respected	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unrespected
relaxed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	tense
scholarly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonscholarly
esthetic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	task-oriented
confident	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	uncertain
sober	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	intoxicated
concerned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	indifferent
friendly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unfriendly
believing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	skeptical
academic achievement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	nonacademic achievement
individualism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	togetherness
beneficial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	harmful
social welfare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	laissez faire
sophisticated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsophisticated
simple	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	complex
sociable	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unsociable
interesting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	dull
disciplined	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	undisciplined
good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	bad
challenging	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	unchallenging
democratic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	authoritarian
bold	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	timid
generous	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	selfish
academic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vocational
self reliant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	dependent
lenient	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	strict
ambitious	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	lazy
wise	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	foolish
dynamic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	stagnant
optimistic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	pessimistic
masculine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	feminine

Table II

The Alignment Of Items
On Each Of The Four Factors

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
1.	*			*
2.		*		
3.			*	
4.	*	*		
5.			*	
6.	*		*	*
7.				*
8.	*		*	
9.	*		*	
10.	*	*		
11.	*			
12.		*	*	
13.			*	*
14.	*			
15.	*			
16.			*	
17.		*		
18.				*
19.	*			
20.	*			
21.	*	*		
22.			*	
23.	*			
24.	*			
25.			*	*
26.	*			
27.	*			
28.	*			
29.	*			
30.	*		*	
31.		*		
32.	*			
33.				
34.	*			
35.	*		*	
36.	*			
37.	*		*	
38.				

Table III

Listing Of Adjectives And Factor Loadings
Exceeding .3000 For Four Factors

FACTOR 1 Social Desirability		FACTOR 2 Academic Attitude		FACTOR 3 Maturity-Stability		FACTOR 4 'Contemporary' vs. Traditional Attitude	
Loading	Adjective	Loading	Adjective	Loading	Adjective	Loading	Adjective
.8235	interesting	.7094	academic	.7329	easy-going	-.6056	traditional
.7887	sociable	.6861	acad. ach.	.7276	relaxed	.5979	uninhib.
.7884	friendly	.6568	scholarly	.6357	confident	-.5510	moral
.7752	dynamic	.4965	sophist.	.5849	believing	-.4521	sober
.7539	concerned	.4483	collegiate	.4669	simple	.4171	individ.
.7443	challeng.	.3239	confident	.4331	wise	-.3845	collegiate
.7217	good	.3023	competent	.4302	respected	.3367	bold
.7119	democratic			.3974	disciplined	.3113	esthetic
.6778	beneficial			.3827	generous		
.6626	generous			.3800	realistic		
.6557	ambitious			.3425	sober		
.6386	competent			.3185	optimistic		
.5937	respected			.3067	moral		
.5757	optimistic						
.5697	wise						
.5096	bold						
.4768	esthetic						
.4616	social welf.						
.3872	confident						
.3730	self-reliant						
.3649	scholarly						
.3621	relaxed						
.3295	sophis.						
.3165	moral						
.3160	uninhib.						

Table IV

Inter-Concept Comparisons For Each
Of The Four Factors On The Pre-May 4 Data
(Dependent t-tests)

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Kent State University vs. KSU Students	+ 4.64**	+4.64**	-3.65**	+6.32**
KSU Faculty vs. Ideal-Teacher	+12.08**	+5.48**	+4.55**	+3.59**
Real-Self vs. Ideal-Self	+11.27**	-3.53**	+8.88**	+8.56**

**p≤.001 (2 tailed test)

Table V

Inter-Concept Comparisons For Each
Of The Four Factors On The Post-May 4 Data
(Dependent t-tests)

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Kent State University vs. KSU Students	+ 3.39*	+5.64**	-2.92*	+4.90**
KSU Faculty vs. Ideal-Teacher	+10.77**	+4.46**	+8.00**	+2.70*
Real-Self vs. Ideal-Self	+11.67**	-3.79**	+9.01**	+8.78**

* $p \leq .05$ (2 tailed test)
** $p \leq .001$ (2 tailed test)

Table VI

Intra-Concept, Pre-Post Comparisons
For Each Of The Four Factors
(Dependent t-tests)

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Kent State University	+5.99**	0.32	-7.75**	-1.55
KSU Students	+4.72**	-0.95	-5.48**	-3.39*
KSU Faculty	+6.53**	-1.26	-3.73*	-1.30
Ideal-Teacher	+1.34	1.54	-0.80	-2.99*
Real-Self	+2.06*	0.15	-2.18*	-1.86
Ideal-Self	+2.62*	0.36	-2.86*	-0.95

*$p \leq .05$ (2 tailed test)
**$p \leq .001$ (2 tailed test)